

OPINIONS AND DECLARATIONS RENDERED BY THE INTER- NATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.
Secretary to the Commission

VOLUME 8. Part 6. Pp. 73—88

OPINION 289

Acceptance of the type selection for the genus *Rantus* Dejean,
1833 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) made by Hope in
1839 and emendation of the foregoing name to *Rhantus*



LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Trust for
Zoological Nomenclature
and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological
Nomenclature by the International Trust at its Publications Office
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7
1954

Price Eight Shillings

(All rights reserved)

Issued 12th October, 1954

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

COMPOSITION AT THE TIME OF THE ADOPTION OF THE RULING GIVEN IN OPINION 289

A. The Officers of the Commission

Honorary Life President : Dr. Karl Jordan (*British Museum (Natural History), Zoological Museum, Tring, Herts., England*).

President : (Vacant).

Vice-President : Senhor Dr. Afranio do Amaral (*Sao Paulo, Brazil*).

Secretary : Mr. Francis Hemming (*London, England*).

B. The Members of the Commission

(arranged in order of precedence by reference to date of election or of most recent re-election, as prescribed by the International Congress of Zoology).

Senhor Dr. Afranio do AMARAL (*S. Paulo, Brazil*) (*Vice-President*) (1st January 1944).

Professor J. R. DYMOND (*University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada*) (1st January 1944).

Professor J. Chester BRADLEY (*Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (28th March 1944).

Professor Harold B. VOKES (*Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, U.S.A.*) (23rd April 1944).

Dr. William Thomas CALMAN (*Coulsdon, Surrey, England*) (1st January 1947).

Professor Béla HANKÓ (*Békéscsaba, Hungary*) (1st January 1947).

Dr. Norman R. STOLL (*Rockefeller Institute for Medical Research, New York, N.Y., U.S.A.*) (1st January 1947).

Professor H. BOSCHMA (*Rijksmuseum van Natuurlijke Historie, Leiden, The Netherlands*) (1st January 1947).

Senor Dr. Angel CABRERA (*Eva Peron, F.C.N.G.R., Argentina*) (27th July 1948).

Mr. Francis HEMMING (*London, England*) (*Secretary*) (27th July 1948).

Dr. Joseph PEARSON (*Tasmanian Museum, Hobart, Tasmania, Australia*) (27th July 1948).

Dr. Henning LEMCHE (*Universitetets Zoologiske Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*) (27th July 1948).

Professor Teiso ESAKI (*Kyushu University, Fukuoka, Japan*) (17th April 1950).

Professor Pierre BONNET (*Université de Toulouse, France*) (9th June 1950).

Mr. Norman Denbigh RILEY (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) (9th June 1950).

Professor Tadeusz JACZEWSKI (*Department of Systematic Zoology, Warsaw University, Warsaw, Poland*) (15th June 1950).

Professor Robert MERTENS (*Natur-Museum u. Forschungs-Institut Senckenberg, Frankfurt a. M., Germany*) (5th July 1950).

Professor Erich Martin HERING (*Zoologisches Museum der Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, Germany*) (5th July 1950).

OPINION 289

ACCEPTANCE OF THE TYPE SELECTION FOR THE GENUS "RANTUS" DEJEAN, 1833 (CLASS INSECTA, ORDER COLEOPTERA) MADE BY HOPE IN 1839 AND EMENDATION OF THE FOREGOING NAME TO "RHANTUS"

RULING : (1) The nominal genus *Rantus* Dejean, 1833 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) is a genus based upon a misidentified type species, but it is hereby directed that the selection by Hope in 1839 of *Colymbetes pulverosus* Stephens, 1828, one of the nominal species included by Dejean in the genus *Rantus*, as the type species of this genus is to be accepted as such, since the designation, under the Plenary Powers, of the nominal species *Dytiscus notatus* Bergsträsser, [1778], which Dejean misidentified as *Colymbetes pulverosus* Stephens, 1828, to be the type species of the genus *Rantus* Dejean would now cause confusion.

(2) The spelling of the generic name *Rantus* Dejean, 1833, is to be emended to *Rhantus*.

(3) The generic name *Rhantus* (emend. of *Rantus*) Dejean, 1833 (gender : masculine) (type species, by selection by Hope (1839), as confirmed under (1) above ; *Colymbetes pulverosus* Stephens, 1828) is hereby placed on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* as Name No. 712.

(4) The specific name *suturalis* Macleay, 1825, as published in the combination *Colymbetes suturalis* is hereby placed on the *Official List of Specific Names in Zoology* as Name No. 120.

(5) The generic name *Rantus* (an Invalid Original Spelling of *Rhantus*) Dejean, 1833, is hereby placed on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Generic Names in Zoology* as Name No. 102.

I.—THE STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On 25th November 1944 Mr. J. Balfour-Browne (*British Museum (Natural History), London*) submitted a preliminary communication on the subject of the species to be accepted as the type species of the genus *Rantus* Dejean, 1833 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) and on the question of the orthography of that generic name. This subject ultimately formed—see paragraph 5 below—the subject of the following application :—

Proposal that the generic name “ *Rantus* ” Dejean, 1833 (Class Insecta, Order Coleoptera) should be emended to “ *Rhantus* ” under Article 19 and that the type species of this genus should be determined under the procedure laid down for dealing with genera based upon misidentified type species

By J. BALFOUR-BROWNE, M.A.

(*Department of Entomology, British Museum (Natural History), London*)

I originally submitted the present proposal to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for the purpose of securing authority for the retention of the spelling *Rhantus* for the well-known coleopterous genus concerned, notwithstanding the fact that as originally published by Dejean in 1833, this name was spelt “ *Rantus* ”. At the time when I submitted this application (April 1940), it was impossible for the Commission to take decisions on new cases, and I realised that considerable delay would be inevitable. Later, a second element entered into this case, when it was realised that under a strict interpretation of the expression “ indication ”, as given in the Commission’s *Opinion* 1, it would be necessary to review the literature for the purpose of determining the place where this generic name was first published. This particular difficulty disappeared in 1948 as the result of the decision of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, to liberalise the provisions of Proviso (a) to Article 25, and to cancel the relevant portion of the *Opinion* referred to above (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 78—80). Finally, it was found that, when the generic name *Rantus* was published on what is now seen to be the first occasion on which this name appeared in the literature, in conditions which satisfy the provisions of Article 25, the genus so named was based upon a misidentified type species. In order that this matter also may be placed on a satisfactory footing, it is necessary to ask the Commission to give a ruling regarding the type species of this genus under the clarified and amended rules for dealing with genera based upon misidentified type species, laid down by the International Congress of Zoology in 1948 (see 1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 158—159).

2. In the circumstances I have redrafted my application, in order both to take account of the decisions taken by the Paris Congress and to include within its scope each of the three problems involved. I deal with these separately in turn, in the following paragraphs.

(1) Author and date of publication of the name "Rantus"

3. The generic name *Rantus* first appeared in print in 1833 in Dejean's *Cat. Coléopt* (ed. 2) : 54. It was there attributed to Eschscholtz, by whom presumably it had been originally suggested in manuscript. Dejean cited four species as belonging to this genus and for three of them cited what he regarded as synonyms. In all, he cited under this generic name eight trivial names previously validly published for nominal species. He did not give any verbal diagnosis for this genus, nor did he designate or indicate a type species. Nevertheless, under the liberalisation of the definition of the expression "indication" adopted by the Paris Congress, the name *Rantus* Dejean, 1833, satisfies the requirements of Proviso (a) to Article 25 of the *Règles* and accordingly possesses rights under the Law of Priority. It is not a homonym of any previously published generic name consisting of the same word, and it is therefore an available name. Further, it is the oldest available generic name for the group of species associated with the species, hitherto recognised as the type species of the genus concerned.

(2) Type species of the genus "Rantus" Dejean, 1833

4. The first author to select a type species for the genus *Rantus* Dejean was Hope, who in 1839 (*Col. Mon*, 2 : 131) selected what he called "*Dytiscus pulverosus* Knoch" as the type species of this genus, which, however, he attributed to Eschscholtz, by whom (as shown above), this name was originally proposed in manuscript. Knoch never published the name *Dytiscus pulverosus* but there is no doubt that the species to which Hope was referring when he made the foregoing type selection was the species which in 1825, Stephens had named *Colymbetes pulverosus* (Stephens, 1825, *Cat* : 49 no. 489), for when dealing with the same species in 1828 (*Ill. Brit. Ent. Mand.* 2 : 69), Stephens added the following synonymy for this species : "*Dy. pulverosus* Knoch—*Co. pulverosus* Steph. Catal., p. 49, No. 489". This species, as I have shown (1939, *Ann. Mag. Hist.* (11) 3 : 109, is the same as that to which MacLeay in 1825 (*Annul. javan.* (ed. 1) : 135) gave the name *Colymbetes suturalis*. On the basis of the foregoing identification, the oldest available trivial name for the species selected as the type species of *Rantus* by Hope in 1838 is *suturalis* MacLeay, 1825.

5. The generic name *Rantus* is universally interpreted in the sense indicated by Hope's type selection, but, before we can accept that as a valid type selection, it is necessary that we should satisfy ourselves that the species selected by Hope was in fact one of Dejean's originally included species. It is at this point that difficulties begin to arise.

The trivial names cited by Dejean under the generic name *Rantus* are as follows :—

1. *notatus* Fabr.

Synonyms : *conspersus* Gyll.
pulverosus Knoch

2. *agilis* Fabr.

Synonym : *suturalis* Harr. [recte *suturellus* Harr.]

3. *adspersus* Fabr.

Synonym : *collaris* Gyll.

4. *suturalis* Dejean. (a new name)

Synonym : *notatus* Gyll.

6. It will be seen from the foregoing list that Dejean did include in his genus *Rantus* a species having the trivial name *pulverosus*, attributed by him to Knoch (doubtless for the same reasons as those explained above in connection with Hope's 1839 type selection) and doubtless denoting the species named *Colymbetes pulverosus* by Stephens in 1825. This nominal species (as already explained) and also that referred to by Dejean as "*conspersus* Gyll.". (= *Dytiscus conspersus* Gyllenhal, 1808, *Ins. suec.* 1 : 482 (nec. Marsham, 1802)), are currently regarded as identical with the species represented by *Colymbetes suturalis* MacLeay, 1825 ; but, contrary to the view expressed in Dejean's *Catalogue*, the species so named is considered to be quite distinct from the species cited by Dejean as *Rantus notatus* Fabr. Dejean was doubtless referring to *Dytiscus notatus* as published by Fabricius in 1781 (*Spec. Ins.* 1 : 296), where, however, Fabricius did not publish this as a new name, the name in question having already been published by Bergsträsser in 1778 (*Nomencl. Ins. Hanau* 1 : 31).

7. It is, however, not now accepted by specialists that the species referred to *Dytiscus* by Gyllenhal, 1808, under the trivial name *notatus*, is the same species as *Dytiscus notatus* Bergsträsser, 1778 ; on the other hand, it is accepted that the species so referred to by Gyllenhal is the same species as that referred to by Fabricius in 1781, as *Dytiscus notatus*. It is now considered by specialists that Fabricius misidentified the *Dytiscus notatus* of Bergsträsser (which is now considered to be the same species as *Dytiscus nebulosus* Forster, 1771, *Nov. Spec. Ins.* 1 : 56) and that Gyllenhal followed Fabricius in this misidentification. Accordingly, the species possessing the misapplied name *Dytiscus notatus* Fabricius, 1781 (nec *Dytiscus notatus* Bergsträsser, 1778), is now referred to as *Rantus frontalis* (Marsham, 1802) (= *Dytiscus frontalis* Marsham, 1802), the name *frontalis* Marsham being the earliest available name for the species (vide Balfour-Browne (J.), 1944, *Ann. Mag. nat. Hist.* (11) 11 : 354). Since Dejean listed as distinct species (1) *notatus* Gyllenhal (a preoccupied name which he proposed to replace by the name *suturalis* Dejean (not *suturalis* MacLeay, 1825)

and (2) *notatus* Fabricius (with synonyms *conspersus* Gyllenhal and *pulverosus* Knoch), it is perfectly clear that he misconceived the Fabrician species and that the species which he identified as *notatus* Fabricius is not that species but *suturalis* MacLeay, 1825 (= *pulverosus* (Knoch MS.) Stephens, 1828).

8. Two conclusions emerge from the data summarised above : (a) that the species *Colymbetes pulverosus* (Knoch MS.) Stephens, 1825, selected as the type species of *Rantus* (Eschscholtz MS.) Dejean by Hope in 1839, is a species which, under the decision taken by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology in Paris in 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 177—180), is to be treated as having been originally included in the genus, and therefore that Hope's selection of this species as the type species of the genus *Rantus*, being the first such selection to be made, is valid under the *Règles* ; (b) that Dejean, in identifying the above species with *Dytiscus notatus* Fabricius, 1781, committed an error of identification and therefore that, as the above species was later validly selected to be the type species of this genus (by Hope in 1839), the genus *Rantus* Dejean, 1833, is a genus based upon a misidentified type species.

9. The position of a genus established on a misidentified type species (which already had been the subject of *Opinions* 65 and 169) was reviewed by the Commission and the Congress in 1948, when it was agreed that, where the Commission was satisfied that such an error had been committed by the original author of a genus, it should use its Plenary Powers to designate as the type species of the genus concerned, the species intended by the original author of the genus (or, if the identity of that species was doubtful, some other species in harmony with current nomenclatorial usage) but that, where the Commission was of the opinion that greater confusion than uniformity would result from using the Plenary Powers in this way, it should direct that the designation or indication, or, as the case might be, selection as the type species of the genus concerned, of the species cited by the original author of the genus be accepted (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 158—159). When we consider the present case in the light of the foregoing decision, it is immediately apparent that greater confusion than uniformity would result if the Commission were to use its Plenary Powers to designate as the type species of the genus *Rantus* Dejean the nominal species "*Rantus notatus* Fabr.", with which Dejean synonymised the nominal species *Colymbetes pulverosus* Stephens, 1825, for such a type designation would run entirely counter to the currently accepted treatment of this genus. It follows therefore that the present case is one which should be dealt with under the second part of the decision summarised above. I accordingly ask the Commission to direct that, notwithstanding the error of identification committed by Dejean at the time (1833) when he published the generic name *Rantus*, the nominal species *Colymbetes pulverosus* Stephens, 1828, included by him in this genus and (in 1839) selected by Hope, as the type species of this genus, is to be accepted as such.

(3) The question whether the name “*Rantus*” Dejean, 1833, should be emended to “*Rhantus*” under Article 19

10. The name *Rantus* was published by Dejean in 1833, without any indication of the origin of the word so selected. Thirteen years later Agassiz (1846, *Nomencl. zool. Index univ.* : 321) pointed out that the correct orthography of the Greek word *ῥαντός*, when transliterated into the Latin alphabet, was not “*rantus*” but “*rhantus*”, and he accordingly emended the spelling of this generic name to *Rhantus*. This emended spelling has ever since been generally adopted; in 1935, however, F. Balfour-Browne restored the original spelling (*Rantus*), arguing that no emendation of a generic name should be accepted “unless made by the original author and within the same volume of the publication in which the original spelling appeared”. The question of the interpretation of Article 19 of the *Règles* was, I am aware, carefully considered by the Commission and the Congress in Paris in 1948, when certain clarifications were agreed upon and arrangements for a comprehensive review of the problems involved in the emendation of names to be carried out by the Secretary to the Commission, in consultation with interested specialists, with a view to a thorough-going clarification of Article 19 at the next (Copenhagen, 1953) meeting of the Congress (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 141—144).¹ It is quite clear from the decisions taken in Paris that the grounds on which F. Balfour-Browne (1935) sought to justify the abandonment of the long-established spelling *Rhantus*, in favour of the original spelling *Rantus*, are invalid, because not in accordance with the *Règles*. In view of the ambiguity of the wording of Article 19 (and, in particular, the absence of guidance as to how to interpret the governing word, “*évident*”), it is possible that for other reasons the emendation of the name *Rantus* to *Rhantus* is not justified under the provisions of this Article. In any case, there can clearly be no finality in this matter until the Commission has given a definite ruling one way or the other.

11. When I originally raised this question with the Commission (April, 1940) I did so because my correspondent Dr. Hugh B. Leach (Vernon, B.C.), had drawn my attention to the fact that in the then recently published Fourth Supplement to the Leng Catalogue of the Coleoptera of North America North of Mexico, Dr. R. E. Blackwelder (United States National Museum, Washington, D.C.), had used the accustomed spelling “*Rhantus*”, notwithstanding the paper published in 1935 referred to above. At the same time, Dr. Leach sent me an extract from a letter which he had received from Dr. Blackwelder, which reads as follows : “*Rantus* and *Dytiscus* do come under Article 19, in my opinion, but each not as a *lapsus calami* but as an error of transcription. The reasons given by Balfour-Browne for not accepting the corrections seem to me to have no basis in the Rules, or in our attempts to get a stable nomenclature. And this in spite of the fact that I do not hesitate to back any change that seems necessary. There

¹ See in this connection paragraph 15 of the present *Opinion*.

is nothing in the Rules that requires that corrections of original spellings must be made by the original author or within a set period of time, but the Appendix to the Rules does indicate that the proper way to transliterate *Rantus* from the Greek is *Rhantus*". It was because I agreed with Dr. Blackwelder that the emended spelling (*Rhantus*) ought to be retained in this case, that I then asked the Commission to give a Ruling in this sense. I am still of the opinion that nothing but unnecessary confusion and instability would result from the reversion from the spelling *Rhantus* to the original but defective spelling *Rantus*, and I accordingly ask the Commission to rule that under Article 19 the emended spelling *Rhantus* is to be accepted and therefore that this genus should be known as *Rhantus* (emend. of *Rantus*) Dejean, 1833.

Recommendation submitted to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

12. In the light of the considerations advanced in the present application, I ask the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature :—

- (1) to give a Ruling that the genus *Rantus* Dejean, 1833, is based upon a misidentified type species, since *Colymbetes pulverosus* Stephens, 1828, which was selected as its type species by Hope in 1839, is not, as erroneously stated by Dejean, the same species as that which he called *Rantus notatus* Fabr. (i.e., *notatus* Bergsträsser, 1778) ; that greater confusion than uniformity would result if the species with which Dejean misidentified *Colymbetes pulverosus* Stephens, 1828, were now to be designated under the Plenary Powers as the type species of the genus *Rantus* Dejean ; and therefore that the species *Colymbetes pulverosus* Stephens, 1828, is to be accepted as the type species of this genus ;
- (2) to declare that under Article 19 the spelling of the generic name published by Dejean in 1833 is to be emended from *Rantus* to *Rhantus* ;
- (3) to place the generic name *Rhantus* (emend. of *Rantus*) Dejean, 1833 (type species, by selection by Hope, 1839 : *Colymbetes pulverosus* Stephens, 1828) on the *Official List of Generic Names in Zoology* ;
- (4) to place the trivial name *suturalis* MacLeay, 1825, as published in the binominal combination *Colymbetes suturalis*, on the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*.

II.—THE SUBSEQUENT HISTORY OF THE CASE

2. *Registration of the present application:* On receipt of Mr. Balfour-Browne's preliminary communication of November

1944, the problems connected with the name *Rantus* Dejean were given the Registered Number Z.N.(S.) 171.

3. *Publication difficulties in the period 1944—1947* : Owing to difficulties arising from paper rationing, shortage of labour at the printing works and similar causes, deliveries by the printer of material sent for printing for the *Bulletin* were so slow that it was thought desirable to withhold further applications until the printer had delivered those already in his hands. In consequence, the present application had not been sent to the printer by the time that in 1946 the Commission found it necessary to make other arrangements for its printing. The delays so involved made it impossible to publish the present application in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* prior to the Session held by the International Commission in Paris in 1948.

4. *Issue of Public Notices in 1947* : On 20th November 1947, however, Public Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in the present case was issued to the serial publications prescribed by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology, Monaco, 1913, for, although the applicant did not ask for the use of those Powers, the alternative to the grant of the application submitted would have been for the Commission to use its Plenary Powers to designate, as the type species of the genus *Rantus* Dejean, 1833, the nominal species intended by Dejean in place of the species which he misidentified with the species ultimately selected by Hope to be the type species of this genus. Thus, the publication of these Notices put the Commission in a position to deal with this case in whichever way it might think proper. The publication of the foregoing Notices elicited no objection to the use of the Plenary Powers in this case.

5. *Postponement of the present application at Paris in 1948* : The present application was not brought before the International Commission at its Session held in Paris in 1948, for it was not certain at that time as to what work should be treated as that in which the name *Rantus* had been first validly published by Dejean, having regard to the fact that on the first occasion on which he published this name (1833, in the 2nd edition of his *Cat. Coléopt.*) Dejean gave no diagnosis for the genus so named

and neither designated nor indicated a type species for it. The general problem of the interpretation to be given to Proviso (a) to Article 25 of the *Règles* so involved was settled by the Paris Congress in favour of recognising, as available, generic names published in the foregoing manner (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 78—80). It was accordingly necessary for the present case to be re-examined in the light of the foregoing decision. This was done in 1950, and the application, so revised, was received on 3rd November of that year. By that time the preparation and publication of the Official Records of the Paris Session had been completed, and it had been possible to resume preparations for the publication in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* of applications relating to individual nomenclatorial cases submitted to the Commission for decision.

6. *Publication of the present application:* The present application, revised in the manner indicated in the immediately preceding paragraph, was sent to the printer in December 1950 and was published on 20th April 1951 in Part 2 of volume 2 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (Balfour-Browne (J.), 1951, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 2 : 40—45).

7. *Issue in 1951 of a Second Series of Public Notices:* Under the revised arrangements approved by the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948 (1950, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 4 : 51—56), Public Notice of the possible use by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature of its Plenary Powers in the present case was given on 20th April 1951 both in Part 2 of volume 2 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (the Part in which Mr. Balfour-Browne's application was published) and also to the other prescribed serial publications. In addition, Notice was given to a number of entomological serial publications likely to be interested. The publication of these Notices elicited the communications relating to the second part of the present application (i.e. that concerned with the orthography of the name *Rantus*) reproduced in the immediately following paragraphs.

8. *Communication received from Professor W. A. F. Balfour-Browne (Collin, Dumfries, Scotland):* On 11th June 1951, Professor W. A. F. Balfour-Browne (Collin, Dumfries, Scotland) addressed

the following communication to the International Commission, raising an objection to the second part of the present application (i.e. the portion relating to the orthography of the generic name *Rantus*) (Balfour-Browne (W. A. F.), 1952, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 6 : 170):—

I have just seen in the 11th May *Science* your notice of proposed suspensions of the Rules, and among the generic names mentioned I see *Rantus*. I have not got any previous literature on this subject but if the suggestion is that the spelling is to be changed to *Rhantus*, I hope that the Commission will not approve that proposal. The rule states that the original spelling is the correct one, and “*Rantus*” is the original spelling.

9. *Communication received from Dr. Per Brinck (Lunds Universitets Zoologiska Institution, Lund, Sweden):* On 9th April 1952 there was received in the Office of the Commission a letter dated 5th April 1952, with enclosure, from Dr. Per Brinck (*Lunds Universitets Zoologiska Institution, Lund, Sweden*) on the subject of the present case. In this letter Dr. Brinck drew attention to a passage on the subject of the orthography of the name *Rantus* Dejean in a paper by himself entitled “*Nomenklatorische und systematische Studien über Dytisciden*” (1944, *Förh. K. fysiogr. Sällsk. Lund* 13 (1943) : 134—146), of which he annexed a copy. The name *Rantus* was the tenth and last of the names dealt with in the foregoing paper. An English translation of the passage relating to it is summarised as follows:—

The name *Rantus* was probably (though not certainly) based on the Greek verbal adjective *ῥαυτός* (derived from the verb “to moisten”). Assuming this is the correct derivation, the question is whether it is wrong to transliterate with a simple “r” (not “rh”). According to Poche (1938 : 313) this is not incorrect. He gives several examples to show that the Romans themselves were not so particular about always transliterating the Greek “spiritus asper” with an “h”. Poche regarded it as wrong therefore to emend names from spellings which the Romans themselves sometimes adopted. Stebbing (1896) came to the same conclusion in regard to another similar case (*Oplophorus/Hoplophorus*): “The Latins themselves were uncertain whether an “H” was a letter or only a breathing . . . Why should we, then, be more Roman than the Romans?”

I therefore regard the Agassiz emendation as unnecessary and prefer to return to the original spelling.

10. Note by the Secretary on Dr. Brinck's comment: The prescribed period of notice relating to the present case had expired at the time when Dr. Brinck's letter was received and the Voting Paper (V.P.(52)6) relating to the name *Rantus* Dejean had just been issued to the Members of the International Commission. In replying to Dr. Brinck, Mr. Hemming explained the stage which had been reached in the consideration of this case, but undertook to bring his representations to the International Commission in a separate note to be circulated as soon as possible. This note, which contained an English translation of the relevant portion of Dr. Brinck's paper, was issued to the Commission on 12th April 1952. Annexed to this note was the following postscript prepared by the Secretary :—

With reference to Dr. Brinck's comment I should draw the attention of the Commissioners to the fact that Section "F" of the *Appendice* to the *Règles* (on the transliteration of Greek words into the Latin alphabet) states in the penultimate example cited that the correct transliteration of a word beginning with the letter "r" surmounted by a rough breathing (*Spiritus asper*) is "rh", the example cited being the word "Rhea". The Poche/Stebbing argument advanced by Dr. Brinck is thus rejected in the *Appendice* to the *Règles*.

III.—THE DECISION OF THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

11. Issue of Voting Paper V.P.(52)6: On 7th April 1952 a Voting Paper (V.P.(52)6) was issued in which the Members of the Commission were invited to vote either for, or against, "the proposal relating to the name *Rantus* Dejean, 1833, as specified in Points (1) to (4) in the last paragraph on pp. 44—45 of volume 2 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature*" [i.e. in paragraph 12 of the application reproduced in the first paragraph of the present *Opinion*].

12. The prescribed Voting Period: As the foregoing Voting Paper was issued under the Three-Month Rule, the prescribed Voting Period closed on 7th July 1952.

13. *Particulars of the Voting on Voting Paper V.P.(52)6* : The state of the voting on Voting Paper V.P.(52)6 at the close of the prescribed Voting Period was as follows :—

(a) *Affirmative Votes had been given by the following sixteen (16) Commissioners (arranged in the order in which Votes were received):*

Calman ; Hering ; do Amaral ; Dymond ; Riley ;
Cabrera ; Stoll ; Esaki ; Hankó ; Pearson ; Bonnet ;
Lemche ; Vokes ; Bradley ; Boschma ; Hemming ;

(b) *Negative Votes:*

None ;

(c) *Voting Paper V.P.(52)6 was not returned by two (2) Commissioners:*

Jaczewski ; Mertens².

14. *Declaration of Result of Vote:* On 8th July 1952, Mr. Hemming, Secretary to the International Commission, acting as Returning Officer for the Vote taken on Voting Paper V.P.(52)6, signed a Certificate that the Votes cast were as set out in paragraph 13 above and declaring that the proposal submitted in the foregoing Voting Paper had been duly adopted and that the decision so taken was the decision of the International Commission in the matter aforesaid.

15. The provisions of Article 19 of the *Règles*, relating to the emendation of incorrectly formed zoological names, were completely revised by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953. Under the decision so taken, the emendation (to *Rhantus*) of a name published in the manner

² Professor Mertens indicated (in a letter dated 7th July, 1952) that he desired to be excused from voting on the present case.

in which the name *Rantus* Dejean, 1833, was published will not in future be permissible under the foregoing Article, and such an emendation, in order to acquire valid force, will require to be the subject of a direction by the International Commission. The Copenhagen Congress adopted, however, a further provision protecting decisions interpreting Article 19 previously taken by the Commission (see, 1953, *Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 45, Decision 74). This latter decision confirms and validates the Ruling in regard to the foregoing name given in the present *Opinion*.

16. On 28th February 1954 Mr. Hemming prepared the Ruling given in the present *Opinion* and at the same time signed a Certificate that the terms of that Ruling were in complete accord with those of the proposal approved by the International Commission in its Vote on Voting Paper V.P.(52)6.

17. The following are the original references for the names which appear in the Ruling given in this *Opinion* :—

Rantus (Invalid Original Spelling of *Rhantus*) Dejean, 1833, *Cat. Coléopt.* (ed. 2) : 54

Rhantus (emend. of *Rantus*) Dejean, 1833, *Cat. Coléopt.* (ed. 2) : 54
suturalis, *Colymbetes*, MacLeay, 1825, *Annul. javan.* (ed. 1) : 135

18. The reference for the type selection for the genus *Rhantus* (emend. of *Rantus*) Dejean, 1833, specified in the Ruling given in the present *Opinion* is :—Hope, 1839, *Col. Mon.* 2 : 131.

19. The gender of the generic name *Rhantus* Dejean, 1833, is masculine.

20. At the time of the adoption of the Ruling given in the present *Opinion*, the expression prescribed for the second portion of the binomen which constitutes the scientific name of a species was the expression “trivial name” and the *Official List* reserved for recording such names was styled the *Official List of Specific Trivial Names in Zoology*, the word “trivial” appearing also in

the title of the *Official Index* reserved for recording rejected and invalid names of this category. Under a decision taken by the Fourteenth International Congress of Zoology, Copenhagen, 1953, the expression "specific name" was substituted for the expression "trivial name" and corresponding changes were made in the titles of the *Official List* and *Official Index* of such names (1953, *Copenhagen Decisions zool. Nomencl.* : 21). The changes in terminology so adopted have been incorporated in the Ruling given in the present *Opinion*.

21. The prescribed procedures were duly complied with by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature in dealing with the present case, and the present *Opinion* is accordingly hereby rendered in the name of the said International Commission by the undersigned Francis Hemming, Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, in virtue of all and every the powers conferred upon him in that behalf.

22. The present *Opinion* shall be known as *Opinion Two Hundred and Eighty-Nine* (289) of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

DONE in London, this First day of March, Nineteen Hundred and Fifty-Four.

*Secretary to the International Commission
on Zoological Nomenclature*

FRANCIS HEMMING